

REMARKS

Undersigned counsel thanks Examiner Jacob for a personal interview held on March 15, 2011, the substance of which is summarized below.

Claim 1 has been cancelled and rewritten as claim 39. Claim 38 is the second independent claim. Support for all pending claims, plus the "Summary of the Invention" which is the same as claim 39, can be found in the specification as follows:

	Page: lines
39. A computer implemented method for processing data for a spreadsheet system model, comprising:	3: 2 - 7; 7: 14 - 18
providing a spreadsheet model specification in a computer system with a plurality of item types which may potentially be provided in the spreadsheet, including:	3: 2 - 11
at least one first-type item for which input data is put into the computer system to indicate that said first-type item can be included in the spreadsheet; and	3: 12
at least one second-type item, wherein second-type items are putatively determinable from one or more operations performed on data stored in a first database, and wherein second-type items are included in the spreadsheet if ascertained to be determinable;	3: 14
putting said input data into the system;	3: 16 - 17
searching, using a processor for the computer system, the input data for a first-type item;	3: 17
storing said first-type item found by the searching step in the first database,	3: 18 - 19

second-type items.	
41. The method of claim 39, wherein storing an item in the first database comprises storing data associated with that item in the first database, said data associated with that item being a name or other flag indicative of the particular item.	4: 3 - 5
42. The method of claim 39, implemented by providing a model specification which is hard coded into the computer program.	7: 21
4. The method of claim 39, wherein in the iterative determining process comprises successively automatically reading only second-type items not previously stored in the first database.	5: 22 - 24
5. The method of claim 39, wherein said first database further comprises modules; and, said method further comprising the step of storing said first-type items in said modules.	4: 14 - 15
6. The method of claim 5, further comprising: configuring each said module to perform operations on said first-type items having at least one similar characteristic which are stored in the same module.	4: 16 -19
7. The method of claim 39, further comprising the step of sorting said first- and second- type items as they are stored in the first database.	4: 20 - 22

8. The method of claim 39, wherein said first- and second- type items comprise predetermined items.	4: 23 - 25
9. The method of claim 39, wherein each second-type item is associated with an item determinant which specifies each prerequisite item for evaluation of the second-type item.	4: 26 - 32
10. The method of claim 9 comprising a determining step of searching the first database for each prerequisite item of the second-type item.	4: 33 - 35
11. The method of claim 10 wherein the determining step includes a Boolean operation which produces a true or false result depending on whether each prerequisite item is located in the first database.	5: 2 - 5
12. The method of claim 11, wherein the first database includes one or more separate storage areas.	5: 6 - 7
13. The method of claim 11, wherein the result of said determining step is true if each prerequisite item is located in the first database.	5: 8 - 9
14. (Cancelled)	
15. (Cancelled)	
16. (Cancelled)	

17. The method of claim 13, comprising storing a second-type item in the first database if the associated item determinant evaluates to true.	5: 16 - 18
18. The method of claim 17, further comprising the step of providing a consolidated storage array for storing items of the second type and for evaluating said item determinants.	5: 19 - 21; 26 7 - 9
19. The method of claim 18, further comprising the step of evaluating the item determinant for each said second-type item not stored in the first database.	5: 22 - 24
20. (Cancelled)	
21. The method of claim 19, comprising the step of storing said second-type items in a second database if associated prerequisite items for said second-type items are not located in the first database.	5: 28 - 31
22. The method of claim 21 comprising the step of repeating the evaluating step for any said second-type items in the second database.	5: 32 - 34
23. (Cancelled)	
24. (Cancelled)	
25. (Cancelled)	
26. The method of claim 22, wherein the second	

database comprises a consolidated instance array.	6: 8 - 9
27. The method of claim 26, further comprising the step of adding said second-type items for which the item determinants evaluate to false to the second database.	6: 5 - 12
28. The method of claim 27, wherein any said second-type item stored in the first database after the evaluating step is performed on the second database is removed from the second database.	6: 13 - 16
29. The method of claim 28, wherein the evaluation step is repeated on said second-type items remaining in the second database at least one further time after any second-type item is transferred to the first database.	6: 17 - 20
30. The method of claim 39, further comprising the step of storing formulae for said second-type items in a formula database and evaluating each said first and/or second-type item stored in the first database in accordance with an associated formula stored in a formula database, and associating with each said second-type item all of said first- and/or second- type item types required before the said second-type item can be determined.	6: 21 - 22 6: 23 - 26 7: 4 - 8
31. (Cancelled)	
32. (Cancelled)	

33. The method of claim 39, wherein the computer system determines which second-type items to read by determining which second-type items could exist, based on data in the first database.	11: 15 - 18
34. The method of claim 39, wherein the spreadsheet model specification includes said at least two second-type items by at least one of: listing a plurality of second-type items; or, defining one or more classes of the second-type item, from which a number of unambiguously identifiable second-type items can be determined.	3: 35 - 36 11: 9 - 14
35. (Cancelled)	
36. The method according to claim 18, wherein one or more iterations of the iterative determining process comprises generating one or more putative second-type items for subsequent reading and assessment.	4: 8 - 10; 3: 27 - 32
37. The method of claim 39, wherein at least one putative second-type item is provided which can be assessed as being able to be determined only if: the first database includes one or more prerequisite items necessary to determine said second-type item; and the first database does not include one or more other specific first or second type items, not being prerequisite items of said putative second-type item.	3: 20 - 32
38. A computer implemented method for processing data for a spreadsheet system model, including the	3: 2 - 7; 7: 14 - 18

steps of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing a spreadsheet model specification in a computer system, the spreadsheet model specification including a plurality of types of item, in respect of which entries may potentially be provided in a spreadsheet to which the spreadsheet system model relates, the types of item including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> at least one first-type item for which input data is input into the computer system; and at least one putative second-type item wherein second-type items are putatively determinable from operations performed on data stored in a first database, associated with at least one of said first or second-type items, and wherein second-type items are included in the database if ascertained to be determinable; searching, using a processor for the computer system, the input data for a first-type item; storing said first-type item found by the searching step, in the first database, performing an iterative process, using the processor, to ascertain whether the first database includes one or more prerequisite items necessary to determine a putative second-type item, the iterative determining process comprising performing a plurality of iterations, wherein: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) each iteration comprises successively automatically reading a putative second-type item; associating that second-type item with an item determinant which specifies each prerequisite item for evaluation of that second-type item; for each second- 	<p>3: 2 - 11</p> <p>3: 12</p> <p>3: 14 10: 22</p> <p>3: 19 - 27</p> <p>3: 17</p> <p>3: 18 - 19</p> <p>4: 8- 10 3: 22 - 24; 4: 9 - 10</p> <p>3: 27 - 34</p>

type item, searching the first database for each prerequisite item for said second-type item; applying a Boolean operation which produces a true or false result depending on whether each prerequisite item is located in the first database; and storing in the first database the second-type item if the item determinant is true; and	5: 2 - 5
(b) the iterative determining process performs repeated iterations according to step (a) indefinitely until an iteration evaluates the determinants of all second-type items not stored in the first database in previous iterations as false; and	6: 1 - 7
automatically outputting, using the processor, an indication that the spreadsheet system model can be produced if items of the model specification are stored into the first database.	3:30 - 32

Claims 1, 4, 8, 15 - 25 and 33 - 38 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashida et al. (US 2002/0091908). In a separate rejection, claims 5 - 7 and 9 - 14 are rejected over Ashida et al. for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a).

The claims have been clarified. One can see the invention stands clear of the reference because Ashida et al pertains to a method of searching for patterns within a data set, treating strong pattern correlations discovered this way as being significant, and then using such correlations to calculate the probability of future events, such as the probability of account cancellation after a certain level of expenses accrue. [0031 - 0033].

In contrast, the present invention does not calculate such probabilities. Rather, it provides a way of processing data for a spreadsheet system model in which a plurality of item types may be input to the spreadsheet, and efficiently determining which system models can be provided based on which data types are available for input.

Accordingly, Ashida et al. does not disclose or suggest the present invention.
Applicant submits that the case is now in condition for allowance.

3-21-2011

.....
Date

Respectfully submitted,

/RobertHahl#33,893/

.....
Robert W. Hahl, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 33,893

Robert Hahl, Ph.D., Patent Attorney
Neifeld IP Law, PC
4813-B Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22304

www.neifeld.com
Tel: 703-415-0012 ext 103
Fax: 703-415-0013